

Wisconsin, from Illinois and from South would give no vote in Congress towards con-

the city of Leocompton to protect the people against whom you impose upon that people against the will of the people. I think there will be the perfect peace and harmony among them all. You will restore peace in that way, and localize the Kansas difficulty! No, sir. The moment you impose a Constitution on that people against their remonstrance and protest, you have nationalized the difficulty. I think that is well known. If you insist upon forcing a Constitution on a people against their will. I hope I may be mistaken, and that such consequences will not result; but, while such are my convictions, I must be permitted to express them. If my doing so brings down or lowers the reputation of that quarter, high or low, from my own section or an opposite section, I must repel those assaults; but I do not choose to go into any crimination or recrimination in regard to consistency on former occasions. I feel that I am willing that my consistency should be judged of by the public. I think my course is pretty well known, and I am willing that the people shall judge of it. If the course of the Senator from Indiana is equally well known, let the people judge of it. I have no desire, no disposition to turn my speeches and old records and old letters, to show his inconsistency. Consistency has very little to do with this question. The great point is, is it right to force a Constitution upon a people against their will? I am not right in my opposition to that act of power and oppression? I would rather argue that question than go into any controversies with political friends or even political opponents. I would prefer that they should consider me so humble an individual that they will not think it necessary to be discussed, inasmuch as during the whole fifteen years I have found them loud in praise of my course as to the political iniquities which they now propose to bring in judgment against me.

Mr. Wilson. I ask no mercy in relation to this matter. I will not provoke controversy with anybody. I shall not shrink from the avowal of my opinions and the vindication of my character, whenever I choose to do it. I may not reply to you, but I may be an object to worry out strength by your course. I will stand by day to day. Whenever I find it failing, I will reserve myself, and then come back and take a raking fire at the whole group. *Laughter.* But whenever I shall feel inclined, I will repel the blow at the time it is struck.

THIRTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

Tuesday, December 22, 1857.

SENATE.

Mr. Wilson introduced a bill to secure to actual settlers the alternate sections of the public lands received in grants to the States for railroads.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the President's annual message.

Mr. Fitch remarked, that if the election took place in Kansas yesterday, Congressional action on the subject would soon be required; that is, assuming that there were no frauds which would vitiate that election. In expressing his views on the subject, he said that the election of the people of the Territory whether to admit or to exclude Slavery should not be supposed to influence his opinions; and he therefore wished to speak on the subject in advance of any possible remarks here of the character of the proceedings as a whole.

He would remark, in advance, that while he should feel bound to comment on some of the views expressed by the Senator immediately before him, [Mr. Douglas] he did not design to repeat him out of respect, as he would say, that a man might, by his own voluntary act, either by promoting discord in the party, or by some other means, place himself beyond the pale of the party, as such were put to the necessity of reading persons out of their organization. He would remark, that if any member of the Democratic party who wished to take a position outside of the party, or who attempted to foment discord in the party in return for some fancied grievance in time past, they would do well to remember the fate of every such attempt that has ever been made, from the days of Burr to those of Van Buren.

Mr. Fitch was in favor of admitting Kansas with whatever Constitution she might present here, provided it was republican in form. The Senator asked the power to submit the Constitution or withhold it, and he was responsible to the people of Kansas for the manner in which they exercised that right. He desired to adopt the course productive of the least evil to the greatest number.

He was in regard, if differing from the President was "action," that Senator had double that amount of faction with himself. He had not become the mere servile tool of any President, so as to feel himself bound to take every recommendation without examining to see if it was for the good of the people, or to harmony in the Democratic party, or not. As he had only to say, if the Democratic Senators and the President would stand by the Cincinnati platform, there would be harmony between them all and himself. Call it faction—call it what you please. He would not be afraid of the Nebraska bill; to stand by the Cincinnati platform; to stand by the organization and principles of the party; and I defy opposition, from whatever quarter it comes."

The Senate, after an executive session, adjourned.

HOUSE.

The House went into committee on the Senate Treasury note bill.

Mr. Grow proposed the sending forth of irredeemable paper currency—there being nothing in the Treasury to redeem the issue, it would do no harm to issue it, and it would be a loan, which would bring forth \$20,000,000 of coin now in secret recesses, unemployed and waiting for a safe investment.

Mr. Smith of Va., Mr. Adrain, and Mr. J. Quincy were severally advocated the bill.

Mr. Morris, of Ohio, moved upon this as an attempt to return to the policy with which the Government commenced, namely, a national currency. He was in favor of a national bank, with such restrictions as were proposed by General Jackson, and he moved that the Government acknowledge its duty to issue a national currency, and was glad that the President had adopted one of the principles in the old Whig platform.

Various amendments were debated, and finally the Committee reported.

The House passed the Senate's Treasury note bill without any amendment. The vote stood—yeas 118, nays 86.

The House also passed the Senate's joint resolution providing for an adjournment of Congress from Thursday next to the 4th of January.

The House then adjourned.

Wednesday, December 23, 1857.

SENATE.

Various branches of the President's message were appropriately referred.

Mr. Simmons gave notice of his intention to introduce a bill to amend the act of March 3, Mr. Stuart, after an elaborate examination of the whole question, said it was not necessary to rely upon an analysis of the Leocompton Convention to detect the fraudulent design of its framers. He said that he had openly avowed and avowed that the reason for not submitting the Constitution, that the people would have voted it down, and hence the necessity of the plot contrived to fasten it upon them against their will. The plan was bold, but it was not intricate. It is a popular act at defiance, but in a manner to excite popular indignation.

of the election on the 21st instant. Why wait for that result, when it was placed in the hands of those who had devised the whole of this infamously wicked scheme? Would Southern Senators suspend their opinions upon the result of an election in Kansas, to be conducted by Gen. Lane and men whom he might select and appoint? Why, then, expect him to repose confidence in Mr. Calhoun and his confederates?

And why this instant haste to hurry Kansas into the Union? Is it to "localize" the Slavery agitation? That agitation he verily believed would be intensified by the admission of Kansas under this odious instrument. So far from being localized, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the people of Kansas refuse to obey the officers elected under it? It would then be a "national" Federal Government to put down with the arm of law, "it would in all probability be "nationalized" by that act. What if this Constitution be recognized by Congress, and the

made a report to provide for the accommodation of reporters and foreign ministers, and a ladies' gallery; that a room should be set apart for a telegraph office; empowering the Door-keeper to employ six additional messengers, and six laborers; and curtailing the classes of persons to be admitted to the floor. The report was adopted.

WASHINGTON, D. C. THURSDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1857.

THE LAST NUMBER OF THE VOLUME.

With this number, the *Era* closes its eleventh volume. How many of our subscribers, at this important juncture, intend to leave us? With how many shall we commence our twelfth volume?

THE NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPEDIA.

We shall notice in our next number the first number of the new American Cyclopaedia, the number of which is just issued. It is published by subscription only.

CAPTURE OF WALKER, AND RETURN TO THE UNITED STATES.

In our news columns we have found an account of the capture of the "man of destiny," as our Southern friends like to style him, and his return to the United States. His career was cut short. The time has not yet come for Americanizing Central America.

This sudden catastrophe must afflict the Southern Propaganda. The President will soon find out that he has stirred up a hornet's nest. Perhaps the Commodore will appear to have displayed too much zeal.

At all events, the Administration must do something to assuage the bitterness of the disappointment of the fire-eaters. What of Cuba?

MR. BENTON AND THE SUPREME COURT.

Historical and Legal Examination of the Decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott Case. By the Author of "The Thirty Years View." New York: D. Appleton & Co. For sale in Washington by J. Shillington.

We are indebted to Mr. Benton for a copy of this "Examination," which, although at one time arrested by a severe attack of sickness in the author, bears all the marks of his inexhaustible intellect, and is a triumphant refutation of the dicta of the Supreme Court, in regard to the "unconstitutionality of the Territory."

In an elaborate introductory note he sets forth at length his objections to the decision of the Court, not only because it was without jurisdiction and wrong in itself, but because it was political, pertaining to the policy of civil government of the Union, interfering with the administration of the affairs of the State.

Another example of the inexactness of which Political Truths are stated, is to be found in the discussion of what is called "Sovereignty." "Sovereignty" means, supreme power. In its highest sense, it belongs to God alone. As defining powers existing in human conditions, it admits of various meanings. It is the highest power in a State—but there may be inferior Sovereignities. There is an absolute Sovereignty, and a limited Sovereignty. That of the Czar is absolute, that of the Queen of England, limited. We do not call our President, Sovereign, and yet, officially, during his term of office, he wields more power than Queen Victoria. We do not style Congress, Sovereign; yet it is less amenable to public opinion than the British Parliament, which is often styled Sovereign. American politicians speak of the Sovereign People, although the People are the "governed," not the Government; and of the Sovereign States, although the Federal Constitution, and the Laws passed in pursuance thereof, are the supreme law of the land, "any thing in the laws of the States to the contrary notwithstanding."

It is vain to attempt to confine the word Sovereignty to one thing, as Governor Walker does in his Letter to the President. Usage forbids it. So restricted a definition would lead to foolish misunderstandings. Sovereignty resides alone in the People, says Mr. Walker—that is, in the People of each State: there is no other Sovereignty. And yet, it is only on rare occasions that this Sovereignty makes itself manifest, as, for example, in the creation, the ratification, or the amendment of a Constitution—never in the ordinary functions of Government, never in the administration.

Sovereignty resides in the People of each State, as the source of all political power. That is true; but the term is greatly expanded in popular acceptance. Each State—that is, the Government of each—being the State organized, is sovereign and independent in relation to other State Governments. The United States—that is, the Government, being the States organized, is sovereign, independent, in relation to all other Governments. The State Government, being supreme within its limits, is Sovereign. The Federal Government, being supreme within its limits, is Sovereign.

The People of each State, being the source of all power in either, are Sovereign, although they cannot act upon the humblest individual except through the limited Sovereignities derived from themselves. The citizen owes allegiance to the Government of his State and to the Government of the United States: to the one he looks for protection—his laws he obeys; he does not acknowledge allegiance to "the People," or look to them for protection; and they do not enact the laws regulating his interests. Strange that the only American Sovereign should be so completely ignored by everybody, except the political theorist and the demagogue!

Southern demagogues of a certain school claim that Sovereignty over the Territories resides alone in the People of the States—or, more precisely, in the People of each State. According to this, there are thirty-one distinct Sovereignities over our Territories, each possessing an equal right to govern them. When they acquired their Sovereignty, how they are to exercise it, how they are to decide, when conflicting in their views, we are not informed. The Constitution of a State defines what the State Government may do, and how it shall be done; the Constitution of the United States defines what the Federal Government may do, and how it shall be done; but we have no Constitution directing how the People of each State shall, as a Sovereign, exercise Sovereign functions over the Territories of the Union.

This Southern notion is too ridiculous for further comment.

Next, we have the theory that the people of a Territory possess Sovereignty, and, in the exercise of their Sovereign rights, have a right to determine their own institutions—a theory just as groundless as the one just noticed. The Sovereignty of the People of a Territory? When do they acquire it? At first, a hundred adventurers settle on a vast domain, acquired by the Government of the United States. Does Sovereignty reside in them? Does settlement invest them with a right to govern the hundreds of thousands of square miles of a Territory, of which they are but a few thousand acres?

They multiply; immigration adds to their numbers. Congress encloses them within certain boundaries—organizes them into a political community—gives them a Constitution—authorizes them to carry on the work of self-government to a certain extent—appoints them a Governor, a Secretary of State, an Attorney General, a Judiciary. Who exercises Sovereign right here—the people of a Territory, or Congress? Can they do more than they are authorized to do? Can they exercise a single power not granted by Congress? And has not the power been again and again reserved by Congress, to revise their laws, and to annul them, should they see proper? Are they Sovereign, then, after their Territorial organization? Where is the evidence? Brigham Young and his People, acting upon this assumption, are denounced as rebels; the House of Representatives, affirming that they are rebels, appoints a Committee to examine the right of their Delegate to hold his seat in that body; the President dispatches an army to put down the rebellion; and if the counsel of Senator Douglas be followed, the act organizing their organization as a Territory will be repealed!

Territorial Sovereignty? Squatter Sovereignty? Popular Sovereignty in Territories? What miserable mockery.

The men who deal most flippantly with these phrases, know that they mean nothing.

The plain truth is that which has always been acted upon, in a greater or less degree: The Sovereignty over the Territories of the Union resides in the Federal Government. The States ceded to the Congress of the Confederation the Northwest Territory; Congress accepted the cession, and provided an Ordinance, in the form of a Compact, for its government. The Congress of the Constitution, through that instrument expressly, became bound by the engagements of the old Congress, and, in pursuance of this obligation, at its first session passed an act not recognizing that ordinance, and giving it effect. The clause in the Constitution, authorizing the Territory or any other property of the United States, was clearly intended to apply to that Territory, but being general in its views, and required by the relations of the Federal Government to any Territory, would apply reasonably to any other Territory which might be acquired.

Whether the framers of the Constitution contemplated further Territorial acquisition, we do not know: certainly they did not grant power in express terms to acquire; although, in conferring on the President and the Senate power to make Treaties, it may be argued that they evidently conferred the power of Territorial acquisition. So, too, the same power might be incidental to the power of Congress to declare war. Conquests might be made, and conquests retained, as indemnity for wrong done, or security for peace.

By Treaty, Conquest, or Purchase, the Federal Government has acquired Territory—not the Sovereign People of each separate State; and the power to govern is plainly inseparable from the power to acquire and possess. Even were there no clause in the Constitution authorizing Congress to make all needful rules and regulations for the Territory or other property of the United States, the Federal Government, from the plain propriety and necessity of the case, must possess this right, as incident to its right to acquire. It alone is Sovereign over the Territories, and in the exercise of its rights, is limited by its discretion—not by the Constitution, for the Constitution is a form of Government for the States, and not for the Territories. Territories have no State rights.

The Federal Government may govern the Territories by a Governor and Council, or through a Governor, Legislature, and Judiciary. It may, if it see proper, withhold the power of self-government, or it may grant it. It may authorize the people of a Territory to form a State Constitution, or refuse them authority. It may ratify the form of a State Constitution formed by them, voluntarily, and receive them into the Union, on their petition, or refuse such ratification and petition; and until admitted into the Union as a State, the people of a Territory have no sovereignty, but are under the control of the Federal Government. The Government may do wrong—may not oppressively—but it must then be arraigned, not on constitutional grounds, but on grounds of reason and natural right. The people of a Territory have no right to resist under the Constitution, or in virtue of the Constitution, for it is not over them; it is not, as assumed by the Pro-Slavery majority of the Supreme Court, for Pro-Slavery purposes, extended to them. Their only right of resistance is, the great natural right of revolution.

We are at pains to make these views prominent, lest some of our readers be perplexed with the discussions which now seem to turn upon the question of Popular Sovereignty, and lose sight of the simple, clear, well-established principles held by the Republicans in common with the founders of our Constitution, concerning the relations of the Federal Government to Territories.

The doctrine that would place them under thirty-one distinct Sovereignities, would make all Territorial Government an impossibility.

The doctrine that claims for the people of a Territory, before or after Territorial organization, Sovereign rights, has no ground to rest upon—is inconsistent with the power always exercised by Congress over Territories, by the consent and co-operation of all parties—and cannot be rebellion.

The doctrine that the Federal Constitution is self-extended to the Territories is false, because that paper was made by the people of the United States, not Territories; for States, not Territories, applies to States, not Territories. If so extended, all Territories would at once rise to the rank and claims of States, and as such, be entitled, without act of Congress, to organize State Constitutions, form State Governments, and elect Representatives and Senators to Congress.

The only true doctrine is, that the Federal Government is Sovereign over Territories, has a right to govern them at its will, to keep them in a Territorial condition so long as it shall deem best, to prohibit to them any institution or practice which it may judge detrimental to the public welfare, to admit them as States, either by authorizing preliminary Conventions to form State Constitutions, or by ratifying the proceedings of Conventions held by the People, of their own motion.

How it shall exercise this large power, is a question of justice and expediency, not constitutional right. Taking the standard of natural right as the measure of the just powers of Government, the Federal Government ought not to oppress these people, ought to protect their rights and promote their interests, ought to consult their will, so far as the general welfare may require, to invest them, as far as may be, done without injury to the United States, with the power of self-government, ought, whenever they desire, and their condition justifies it, admit them as States. In regard solely to Kansas, it has done wrong, in repealing the act protecting the Territory against Slavery; in giving aid and countenance to attempts to force Slavery upon it; in recognizing as a Legislative

POLITICAL TRUTHS—RIGHT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT—POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY.

It is impossible to state the fundamental Truths of Political Science with mathematical exactness. Theorists who attempt this, and then undertake to reason accordingly, fall into inextricable difficulties.

The axiom of the Declaration of Independence, that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," needs careful interpretation to give it any practical value. Let us attempt to apply the Principle which seems so intelligently enunciated to a State—for example, South Carolina. Who are the "governed"? Men, women, and children—white, black, and mulatto—free people and slaves. Does the Government of the State derive its "just powers" from the consent of all these classes? Literally, all are "governed"—but, as a matter of fact, we know that slaves, and colored people, and women, and children, are not included in that term: their consent is not asked to the endowment of the Government with any power; all that is necessary is, the consent of the free white males. But, here again we must resort to interpretation. Only free white males over twenty-one are meant. Why?

By what law of nature is it, when self-evident principle is it, that free white males of eighteen, nineteen, twenty, are excluded? And is the consent of all free white males over twenty-one necessary to secure a just power to the Government? No—otherwise there never could be any just Government. The consent of only a majority of them is required. Must the consent be formal or implied, preliminary or subsequent? The Declaration is syncretic or not?

Here then is a great Truth, as it is called, of the Declaration of Independence, stated in terms so inexact as to require a series of constructions to make it intelligible and fit for application. The proposition that "all Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," means, generally, that they derive their power from the consent of a majority of males over twenty-one, or exceptionally, as in the case of South Carolina and other slave States, from the consent of a majority of the free white males over twenty-one—the consent in both cases being either formal or implied.

This may answer as a convenient definition of a Principle, acted upon in this country, but it will not bear the test of rigid scrutiny. Suppose, for instance, the majority of free white males should endow the Government with power to prohibit religious worship except in one way, and to exact a certain religious belief as a test of eligibility to office, would it be a just power?

Every one sees that something more is necessary to constitute a just power in Government, than the consent of the governed—the majority of males over twenty-one. It must be in accordance with justice—with the natural right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as inherent in every human being. Right and wrong do not depend upon majorities or minorities. Neither a minority nor the whole of a community can invest Government with a just power to do injustice.

Another example of the inexactness of which Political Truths are stated, is to be found in the discussion of what is called "Sovereignty." "Sovereignty" means, supreme power. In its highest sense, it belongs to God alone. As defining powers existing in human conditions, it admits of various meanings. It is the highest power in a State—but there may be inferior Sovereignities. There is an absolute Sovereignty, and a limited Sovereignty. That of the Czar is absolute, that of the Queen of England, limited. We do not call our President, Sovereign, and yet, officially, during his term of office, he wields more power than Queen Victoria. We do not style Congress, Sovereign; yet it is less amenable to public opinion than the British Parliament, which is often styled Sovereign. American politicians speak of the Sovereign People, although the People are the "governed," not the Government; and of the Sovereign States, although the Federal Constitution, and the Laws passed in pursuance thereof, are the supreme law of the land, "any thing in the laws of the States to the contrary notwithstanding."

It is vain to attempt to confine the word Sovereignty to one thing, as Governor Walker does in his Letter to the President. Usage forbids it. So restricted a definition would lead to foolish misunderstandings. Sovereignty resides alone in the People, says Mr. Walker—that is, in the People of each State: there is no other Sovereignty. And yet, it is only on rare occasions that this Sovereignty makes itself manifest, as, for example, in the creation, the ratification, or the amendment of a Constitution—never in the ordinary functions of Government, never in the administration.

Sovereignty resides in the People of each State, as the source of all political power. That is true; but the term is greatly expanded in popular acceptance. Each State—that is, the Government of each—being the State organized, is sovereign and independent in relation to other State Governments. The United States—that is, the Government, being the States organized, is sovereign, independent, in relation to all other Governments. The State Government, being supreme within its limits, is Sovereign. The Federal Government, being supreme within its limits, is Sovereign.

The People of each State, being the source of all power in either, are Sovereign, although they cannot act upon the humblest individual except through the limited Sovereignities derived from themselves. The citizen owes allegiance to the Government of his State and to the Government of the United States: to the one he looks for protection—his laws he obeys; he does not acknowledge allegiance to "the People," or look to them for protection; and they do not enact the laws regulating his interests. Strange that the only American Sovereign should be so completely ignored by everybody, except the political theorist and the demagogue!

Southern demagogues of a certain school claim that Sovereignty over the Territories resides alone in the People of the States—or, more precisely, in the People of each State. According to this, there are thirty-one distinct Sovereignities over our Territories, each possessing an equal right to govern them. When they acquired their Sovereignty, how they are to exercise it, how they are to decide, when conflicting in their views, we are not informed. The Constitution of a State defines what the State Government may do, and how it shall be done; the Constitution of the United States defines what the Federal Government may do, and how it shall be done; but we have no Constitution directing how the People of each State shall, as a Sovereign, exercise Sovereign functions over the Territories of the Union.

This Southern notion is too ridiculous for further comment.

Next, we have the theory that the people of a Territory possess Sovereignty, and, in the exercise of their Sovereign rights, have a right to determine their own institutions—a theory just as groundless as the one just noticed. The Sovereignty of the People of a Territory? When do they acquire it? At first, a hundred adventurers settle on a vast domain, acquired by the Government of the United States. Does Sovereignty reside in them? Does settlement invest them with a right to govern the hundreds of thousands of square miles of a Territory, of which they are but a few thousand acres?

They multiply; immigration adds to their numbers. Congress encloses them within certain boundaries—organizes them into a political community—gives them a Constitution—authorizes them to carry on the work of self-government to a certain extent—appoints them a Governor, a Secretary of State, an Attorney General, a Judiciary. Who exercises Sovereign right here—the people of a Territory, or Congress? Can they do more than they are authorized to do? Can they exercise a single power not granted by Congress? And has not the power been again and again reserved by Congress, to revise their laws, and to annul them, should they see proper? Are they Sovereign, then, after their Territorial organization? Where is the evidence? Brigham Young and his People, acting upon this assumption, are denounced as rebels; the House of Representatives, affirming that they are rebels, appoints a Committee to examine the right of their Delegate to hold his seat in that body; the President dispatches an army to put down the rebellion; and if the counsel of Senator Douglas be followed, the act organizing their organization as a Territory will be repealed!

Territorial Sovereignty? Squatter Sovereignty? Popular Sovereignty in Territories? What miserable mockery.

The men who deal most flippantly with these phrases, know that they mean nothing.

The plain truth is that which has always been acted upon, in a greater or less degree: The Sovereignty over the Territories of the Union resides in the Federal Government. The States ceded to the Congress of the Confederation the Northwest Territory; Congress accepted the cession, and provided an Ordinance, in the form of a Compact, for its government. The Congress of the Constitution, through that instrument expressly, became bound by the engagements of the old Congress, and, in pursuance of this obligation, at its first session passed an act not recognizing that ordinance, and giving it effect. The clause in the Constitution, authorizing the Territory or any other property of the United States, was clearly intended to apply to that Territory, but being general in its views, and required by the relations of the Federal Government to any Territory, would apply reasonably to any other Territory which might be acquired.

Whether the framers of the Constitution contemplated further Territorial acquisition, we do not know: certainly they did not grant power in express terms to acquire; although, in conferring on the President and the Senate power to make Treaties, it may be argued that they evidently conferred the power of Territorial acquisition. So, too, the same power might be incidental to the power of Congress to declare war. Conquests might be made, and conquests retained, as indemnity for wrong done, or security for peace.

By Treaty, Conquest, or Purchase, the Federal Government has acquired Territory—not the Sovereign People of each separate State; and the power to govern is plainly inseparable from the power to acquire and possess. Even were there no clause in the Constitution authorizing Congress to make all needful rules and regulations for the Territory or other property of the United States, the Federal Government, from the plain propriety and necessity of the case, must possess this right, as incident to its right to acquire. It alone is Sovereign over the Territories, and in the exercise of its rights, is limited by its discretion—not by the Constitution, for the Constitution is a form of Government for the States, and not for the Territories. Territories have no State rights.

The Federal Government may govern the Territories by a Governor and Council, or through a Governor, Legislature, and Judiciary. It may, if it see proper, withhold the power of self-government, or it may grant it. It may authorize the people of a Territory to form a State Constitution, or refuse them authority. It may ratify the form of a State Constitution formed by them, voluntarily, and receive them into the Union, on their petition, or refuse such ratification and petition; and until admitted into the Union as a State, the people of a Territory have no sovereignty, but are under the control of the Federal Government. The Government may do wrong—may not oppressively—but it must then be arraigned, not on constitutional grounds, but on grounds of reason and natural right. The people of a Territory have no right to resist under the Constitution, or in virtue of the Constitution, for it is not over them; it is not, as assumed by the Pro-Slavery majority of the Supreme Court, for Pro-Slavery purposes, extended to them. Their only right of resistance is, the great natural right of revolution.

We are at pains to make these views prominent, lest some of our readers be perplexed with the discussions which now seem to turn upon the question of Popular Sovereignty, and lose sight of the simple, clear, well-established principles held by the Republicans in common with the founders of our Constitution, concerning the relations of the Federal Government to Territories.

The doctrine that would place them under thirty-one distinct Sovereignities, would make all Territorial Government an impossibility.

The doctrine that claims for the people of a Territory, before or after Territorial organization, Sovereign rights, has no ground to rest upon—is inconsistent with the power always exercised by Congress over Territories, by the consent and co-operation of all parties—and cannot be rebellion.

The doctrine that the Federal Constitution is self-extended to the Territories is false, because that paper was made by the people of the United States, not Territories; for States, not Territories, applies to States, not Territories. If so extended, all Territories would at once rise to the rank and claims of States, and as such, be entitled, without act of Congress, to organize State Constitutions, form State Governments, and elect Representatives and Senators to Congress.

The only true doctrine is, that the Federal Government is Sovereign over Territories, has a right to govern them at its will, to keep them in a Territorial condition so long as it shall deem best, to prohibit to them any institution or practice which it may judge detrimental to the public welfare, to admit them as States, either by authorizing preliminary Conventions to form State Constitutions, or by ratifying the proceedings of Conventions held by the People, of their own motion.

How it shall exercise this large power, is a question of justice and expediency, not constitutional right. Taking the standard of natural right as the measure of the just powers of Government, the Federal Government ought not to oppress these people, ought to protect their rights and promote their interests, ought to consult their will, so far as the general welfare may require, to invest them, as far as may be, done without injury to the United States, with the power of self-government, ought, whenever they desire, and their condition justifies it, admit them as States. In regard solely to Kansas, it has done wrong, in repealing the act protecting the Territory against Slavery; in giving aid and countenance to attempts to force Slavery upon it; in recognizing as a Legislative

body, an assemblage of men elected through notorious fraud and violence; in bestowing patronage on the chief actors in this transaction; and in now attempting to bring Kansas into the Union with a Pro-Slavery Constitution; which it knows, and the whole country knows, is repudiated by four-fifths of its qualified voters. In all this, we do not say it has violated the Constitution, but it has trampled upon justice and natural right, and made itself an accomplice in oppression and fraud. It has abused its unquestioned Sovereignty over the Territory, by disregarding the will of the majority, by trampling upon the Democratic doctrine of the right of self-government, by a policy, subversive of the peace and order of the Territory, detrimental to the honor and dangerous to the Union of these States.

PRESIDENTIAL INTERVENTION AGAINST SLAVERY.

Mr. Douglas was severely censured by some Administration Senators, for insinuating that Washington influence would be brought to bear, to induce the Pro-Slavery men in Kansas to vote for the Constitution without Slavery, so as to embarrass him and his friends in their opposition to the Constitution.

The Washington correspondent of the Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer*, who seems to speak with authority concerning the acts and counsels of the Administration, in a letter to that paper dated December 21st, makes the following curious revelation:

"The President adheres firmly to the position assumed in his annual message, and thinks Gov. Walker's pronouncement will not entirely strip him. If the Constitution should be annihilated of the Slavery clause by the vote in Kansas to-day, and such Mr. Buchanan thinks will be the case, he is anxious Congress should accept the Ordinance, and admit the State thus banishing from the halls of national legislation this apple of discord, this bone of contention, this fruitful source of agitation and sectional excitement."

I understand that Gen. Denver, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, was dispatched to Kansas, with special instructions to induce every Administration Democrat, whether Pro-Slavery or not, to vote against the Slavery clause of the Lecompton Constitution. This was the only salvation for the Constitution; and if the Free State men refused to vote it out, the Pro-Slavery men would have it to do. Events transpiring, after Gen. Denver left here, indeed the President to appoint him Secretary of the Territory of Kansas, in the place of Mr. Stanton, removed.

The gentleman who writes the foregoing is a warm supporter of the Administration, and is writing to the leading Administration paper of the South. We presume he knows whereof he affirms. If the statement be true, it furnishes an extraordinary illustration of the doctrine of Non-Interference, so strongly insisted upon by the Administration; and it shows, too, the desperate shifts the President has resorted to for the purpose of maintaining an untenable position.

ANOTHER TEST.

"A Northern Democratic Editor" in Washington publishes "a card" in the *Union*, deprecating the severe strictures of Senator Douglas on the conduct of certain editors from the North, who, happening to be here, are sending home by their papers animadversions on his course. This particular editor avers his sincerity and purity, and sees not how Judge Douglas could complain, were adherence to the policy of recognizing the Lecompton Constitution made a party test. The Kansas-Nebraska act, he says, the moment it became an Administration measure, was made "a test of straight-out Democracy." He continues:

"It was this test, however, that gave by turns every State in the North to the Black Republican, and to the Senator himself. Black Republican colleagues in the Senate. It was this test, though, that sifted the Democratic party, and gave it ridance of all the Anti-Slavery, Abolition elements that had given it so much trouble before. While the peace of the Territory is preserved, and the freed election secured, the interests of the people, and demanding admission under it as a State of the Union. This was placed before the people of the Territory, and each President of Congress.

body, an assemblage of men elected through notorious fraud and violence; in bestowing patronage on the chief actors in this transaction; and in now attempting to bring Kansas into the Union with a Pro-Slavery Constitution; which it knows, and the whole country knows, is repudiated by four-fifths of its qualified voters. In all this, we do not say it has violated the Constitution, but it has trampled upon justice and natural right, and made itself an accomplice in oppression and fraud. It has abused its unquestioned Sovereignty over the Territory, by disregarding the will of the majority, by trampling upon the Democratic doctrine of the right of self-government, by a policy, subversive of the peace and order of the Territory, detrimental to the honor and dangerous to the Union of these States.

PRESIDENTIAL INTERVENTION AGAINST SLAVERY.

Mr. Douglas was severely censured by some Administration Senators, for insinuating that Washington influence would be brought to bear, to induce the Pro-Slavery men in Kansas to vote for the Constitution without Slavery, so as to embarrass him and his friends in their opposition to the Constitution.

The Washington correspondent of the Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer*, who seems to speak with authority concerning the acts and counsels of the Administration, in a letter to that paper dated December 21st, makes the following curious revelation:

"The President adheres firmly to the position assumed in his annual message, and thinks Gov. Walker's pronouncement will not entirely strip him. If the Constitution should be annihilated of the Slavery clause by the vote in Kansas to-day, and such Mr. Buchanan thinks will be the case, he is anxious Congress should accept the Ordinance, and admit the State thus banishing from the halls of national legislation this apple of discord, this bone of contention, this fruitful source of agitation and sectional excitement."

I understand that Gen. Denver, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, was dispatched to Kansas, with special instructions to induce every Administration Democrat, whether Pro-Slavery or not, to vote against the Slavery clause of the Lecompton Constitution. This was the only salvation for the Constitution; and if the Free State men refused to vote it out, the Pro-Slavery men would have it to do. Events transpiring, after Gen. Denver left here, indeed the President to appoint him Secretary of the Territory of Kansas, in the place of Mr. Stanton, removed.

The gentleman who writes the foregoing is a warm supporter of the Administration, and is writing to the leading Administration paper of the South. We presume he knows whereof he affirms. If the statement be true, it furnishes an extraordinary illustration of the doctrine of Non-Interference, so strongly insisted upon by the Administration; and it shows, too, the desperate shifts the President has resorted to for the purpose of maintaining an untenable position.

"A Northern Democratic Editor" in Washington publishes "a card" in the *Union*, deprecating the severe strictures of Senator Douglas on the conduct of certain editors from the North, who, happening to be here, are sending home by their papers animadversions on his course. This particular editor avers his sincerity and purity, and sees not how Judge Douglas could complain, were adherence to the policy of recognizing the Lecompton Constitution made a party test. The Kansas-Nebraska act, he says, the moment it became an Administration measure, was made "a test of straight-out Democracy." He continues:

"It was this test, however, that gave by turns every State in the North to the Black Republican, and to the Senator himself. Black Republican colleagues in the Senate. It was this test, though, that sifted the Democratic party, and gave it ridance of all the Anti-Slavery, Abolition elements that had given it so much trouble before. While the peace of the Territory is preserved, and the freed election secured, the interests of the people, and demanding admission under it as a State of the Union. This was placed before the people of the Territory, and each President of Congress.

The Legislature of Kansas, at its special session, acted with prudence and energy.

The Militia Bill was necessary to save the Territory from being exposed through the remissness or sinister policy of the Governor, who, holding his appointment from Washington, might entertain views inconsistent with the interests of the people.

His provision for submitting the Lecompton Constitution to a vote of the People on the 4th of January, will test the sense of the whole People in regard to that instrument, and when the returns shall be sent to Congress, the President may find reason to change his position.

The Legislature was undisturbed during its session. General Cass, in the Letter of Instructions to Mr. Denver, now Acting Governor, says:

"The Territorial Legislature doubtless convened on the 7th inst., and while it remains in session, its members are entitled to be secure in their offices, and no interference of this kind must also be respected. Should it authorize an election by the people for any purpose, this election should be held without interruption, no less than those authorized by the Convention. While the peace of the Territory is preserved, and the freed election secured, the interests of the people, and demanding admission under it as a State of the Union. This was placed before the people of the Territory, and each President of Congress.

Mr. Denver is now exercising the functions of Governor. The disturbances at Fort Scott did not grow out of the elections, but out of feuds between the Free State and Pro-Slavery men. Judge Williams, through the *Union*, charges the blame upon the former, the correspondent of the *St. Louis Democrat*, on the latter. Several lives were lost, on both sides, and United States troops were called out. The particulars have not yet reached us, but the accounts seem to be exaggerated.

Mr. Broderick versus Mr. Broderick.

The California Senator, Mr. Broderick, on Wednesday last week came on boldly against President Buchanan in his Kansas policy. When Democrats grow mainly and outspoken, there is hope that the race of doughfaces may come to an end. Mr. Broderick spoke as follows:

"As I am the only Senator, I believe, on this side of the House who feels disposed, with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan, to oppose the Lecompton Constitution, I should like to debate for a very few minutes on this question."

"I have listened to the debate very attentively, and while I agree with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan in most of what they have said, I disagree with them in regard to the President's course. I think that when the President of the United States sent Gov. Walker and the Secretary Stanton to Kansas, they found the people there in a state of insurrection, and after a great deal of labor on the part of those gentlemen, they restored the peace of the Territory. I think the President of the United States and his Cabinet are alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington before the President of the United States issued his message. He conveyed to the President the result of his mission on the subject of Kansas. I understand that he told him that fifteen out of the thirty-four counties in Kansas were deprived of a voice in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention. I understand this subject, and I know that the President of the United States is alone responsible for the present outbreak in Kansas. Governor Walker had returned to Washington

[illegible]